## REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified priority document. Applicants also thank the Examiner for indicating that the drawings are acceptable, and for providing a signed PTO Form 1449 with regards to the July 12, 2004 and December 20, 2001 Information Disclosure Statements.

### Objection to Claim 16

Claim 16 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants have amended claim 16 to resolve this administrative matter.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulman (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,567) in view of Hirsch (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,282).

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that Dulman discloses the maintenance operation that performs fault diagnosis and recovery operations via the Internet (citing Figs. 1-4, column 3 lines 48-64, column 8 line 50 to column 9 line 65, and column 11 line 36 to column 12 line 18). The Examiner acknowledges that Dulman does not specifically disclose a centralized maintenance system.

Nonetheless, the Examiner states that Hirsch discloses a centralized maintenance management system for a mobile telephone system (citing Fig. 1 and the Abstract), comprising: accessing information providing service (OMC) from a maintenance terminal (LMTr); and searching a database (TB) for fault data and a diagnosis dictionary (citing column 8 line 47 to column 12 line 28). Therefore, the Examiner alleges, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Dulman system modified by Hirsch in order to shorten the diagnosis/recovery time.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

accessing an information providing server of a portable telephone system centralized maintenance management center over the Internet from a maintenance terminal to perform fault diagnosis and recovery operations of said portable telephone system; and

searching a database server in which fault data and a diagnosis dictionary are stored through said information providing server so that data necessary for fault diagnosis and fault recovery are acquired by said maintenance terminal.

Applicants respectfully submit that not only do the combination of Hirsch and Dulman fail to disclose or suggest features of the present invention, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not have been motivated to combine the two references.

First, the Examiner states that Hirsch discloses searching a database (TB) for fault data and a diagnosis dictionary (citing column 8 line 47 to column 12 line 28). Applicants note that a review of Hirsch does not at all reveal the terms or alludes to features such as "fault data" or "diagnosis dictionary". Rather, Hirsch is quite clear that its purpose is to control operator access

to a network (see col. 3, lines 31-36). This is necessary to maintain proper configuration management of the network (see col. 2, lines 34-67). Therefore, the Examiner's citation of Hirsch and its teachings of "fault data" or "diagnosis dictionary" is apparently based on improper hindsight in view of Applicants' own application since these features are not disclosed.

In addition, the database that the Examiner cites (TB) is disclosed in Hirsch as an LMT Access Table. The LMT Access Table stores operator records (see col. 3, line 63 - col. 4, line 10). The Examiner has not shown where or how maintenance data is disclosed in an LMT Access Table. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 2 recites connections to remote maintenance and engineering terminals. The Examiner states that Dulman further discloses development and maintenance for operation of the system (column 2 line 4-8), which means the maintenance, and operation performed by a group of developing and maintaining engineers. Applicants respectfully submit that all systems are developed and maintained in some manner. This general rejection by the Examiner fails to disclose the specific *connection* features recited in claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable for this reason as well as its dependency on claim 1.

Claim 3 recites a diagnosis dictionary which the Examiner states that Hirsch discloses contents of the diagnosis information stored in the database table (citing the Abstract). As above, the table disclosed in Hirsch, and particularly the Abstract is related to operator access. As such, a diagnosis dictionary is neither disclosed nor suggested. Therefore, claim 3 is allowable for this feature, as well as it dependency on claim 1.

The foundation for the Examiner's rejection of claims 8, 9, 17, and 18 are for the same reasons as the rejection of claim 1. For the reasons discussed above, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Dulman and Hirsch. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for similar reasons as discussed above.

Claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulman in view of Hirsch and further in view of Sasabe et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0046329). First, claims 4-7 are allowable at least based on their dependency on claim 1.

Regarding claims 4-7, the Examiner's rejection states that it would have been obvious at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Sasabe et al. with Dulman "to process legal steps in order to improve the service performance." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify what is meant by "process legal steps" so that a clearer understanding of the motivation can be understood since the Examiner provides no reference as to disclosure in any reference on where the motivation to combine the references can be found.

Further, the Examiner will kindly note that Sasabe et al. and the present invention were commonly owned at the time the present invention was made. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove Sasabe et al. as a reference, and allow claims 4-7.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulman in view of Hirsch and further in view of Bouix et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,297,193). The Examiner acknowledges that Hirsch does not specifically disclose transmitting fault recovery data. However, the Examiner states that Bouix et al., in the same field of invention, disclose a maintenance ticket transmitted to a database (citing column 6 lines 19-23). Therefore, the

Examiner alleges, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hirsch, modified by Bouix to enable regional operating personnel to consult data in the case of maintenance parts or system. Applicants respectfully submit that again, the summary conclusion provided by the Examiner fails to identify the motivation why the references are combinable. The mention of a maintenance ticket being transmitted in a patent does not provide the motivation to combine the two references, nor does the Examiner explain the motivation to combine. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection was based on improper hindsight.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Kimble
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 17, 2005